

**MINUTES OF THE BARGAINING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD
FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

Present: Alderpersons Fliss, Brickner and Wattawa

Also Present: City Administrator Rhode, City Clerk/Treasurer Uecker, Chief Lockwood, Captain Trost, City Engineer Dejewski, Mechanic Bob Melton, Health Administrator Scott, interested citizens

Chairwoman Fliss called the meeting to order at 4:43 p.m.

Moved by Alderman Wattawa, seconded by Alderman Brickner to place on file the minutes of the Bargaining Committee meeting held February 3, 2016 and the minutes of the Joint Bargaining/Legislative Committee meeting held February 9, 2016. Motion carried.

Memo from the City Engineer re: Department of Public Works:

City Engineer Dejewski presented the Committee with a Scheduled Annual Wage Adjustment and Pay Range that could be implemented for the Department of Public Works. The adjustments/pay range are split between Highway Utility and Equipment Operators and Mechanic. The range was set using Cudahy, South Milwaukee and Greendale as comparables.

Highway Utility and Equipment Operators – Pay Range \$18.00 - \$28.00

- \$18.00 Starting pay if employee has CDL, if not it would be \$17.50 and increased to \$18.00 upon obtaining CDL within 3 months of hire date

- \$20.00 Increase based upon successful completion of probationary period. Passing probation would be considered a “performance review” as related to pay ranges. Let it be noted that the current probationary period is one year.

- \$22.76 Increase based upon demonstration of proficiency on equipment, coming in for all overtime possible and 2 performance reviews with a raw rating of 2.0 or better

- \$25.41 Increase based upon demonstration of continued proficiency on equipment, coming in for all overtime possible, demonstration of ability to complete tasks without constant supervision. Has a performance raw score of 2.4 or better for third performance review

Alderman Wattawa asked why the steps? City Administrator Rhode stated that the City doesn’t have a mechanism in place to bring new employees to the rate of their peers. He felt the first three steps were good but struggles with the dollar amount for the 4th step. City Engineer Dejewski stated that in looking at the comparable communities, the \$25.41 fell in line with their mid-range pay scale. It is also the wage that most of the DPW are at now and reflects what they were making in 2013.

Mechanic – Pay Range \$20.00 - \$30.00

- \$20.00 Starting pay rate

- \$22.00 Increase based upon successful completion of 1 year probation
- \$24.75 Increase based upon demonstration of proficiency on repairing equipment in a timely manner. Has a performance raw rating of 2.3 or better
- \$27.75 Increase based upon demonstration of continued proficiency on repairing equipment in a timely manner. Has a performance raw rating of 2.5 or better

City Engineer Dejewski explained that the difference between the pay ranges is that the mechanic position is one person and a skilled position. Comparables were used as well as trying to mirror the mid-range wages of those comparables. She also reiterated that there is a performance component linked to the pay range steps.

Alderman Brickner asked what the reference to Longevity Pay was. It was explained that prior to Act 10, employees received an additional dollar amount based on years of service. Post Act 10, longevity pay was rolled into the hourly wage and employees no longer receive additional pay for years of service.

Alderman Wattawa questioned how long would it take to progress through the wage scale. In other communities, as well as St. Francis, it could take years longer than the four presented. Cudahy has steps for increases, very similar to what the unions had in the past and it is a 5 step scale. He also questioned if the increases came too quickly – you could jump \$7/hour in three years. Alderwoman Fliss commented that she felt if employees were doing the same job, they should be receiving the same pay.

City Administrator Rhode said that the challenge with the \$25.41 rate is that it is a significant increase and doesn't know if that is the "new" normal in DPW's. He suggested changing the Step 4 to \$24.50 and add a 5th step that would be based on the lowest paid DPW worker, or whatever the Committee felt it should be. Alderman Brickner agreed that a 4 year step was aggressive but again there is no automatic advancing through the steps as had been in the union contracts. These step increases are performance based. Alderwoman Fliss felt that these proposed pay ranges will need to be reviewed and adjusted every few years.

After further discussion, the proposed steps were agreed to: \$18.00/\$20.00/\$22.76/\$24.50/\$25.67. City Administrator Rhode will include them in the General Employees Wage Resolution for the Committee to review at the next meeting. City Administrator Rhode reminded the Committee that the mechanic did get a \$0.50/hour bump last year.

Also included in the City Engineers memo was a request to adjust the current wages of two DPW employees who, because of union negotiations, gave up a percentage of their hourly rate to be allowed to move out of the City. Since residency is no longer required because of state law, she felt it would be far to give them a one-time hourly increase of \$0.50. Those two employees would still be at a lower rate than their co-workers. Alderman Brickner felt that it shouldn't be done as it will affect the pay range and that those employees made the decision to move out of the City and at the time, it was a bargainable item. Alderwoman Fliss felt that giving that increase would make a difference in the morale of the

department and that all of the unaffected DPW employees were ok with them getting that increase. City Administrator Rhode just questioned where this decision would start and stop.

Moved by Alderwoman Fliss, seconded by Alderman Brickner to recommend approval of the Scheduled Annual Wage Adjustments and Pay Ranges as discussed and amended. Motion carried.

Pay For Performance:

City Administrator Rhode reviewed the spreadsheet with the Committee. The average increase in 2014 was 2.1% and totaled \$26,005.36. In 2015 it is 2.07% and totals \$25,204.34. Those increases do not reflect a pay for performance increase as of yet for the City Administrator. Alderwoman Fliss commented that the proposed 2015 increases do fall within the budgeted amount.

City Administrator Rhode stated that the raw score is based on a range of 0 – 4. The majority of the increases are 1.74% to 2.0%.

Moved by Alderwoman Fliss, seconded by Alderman Wattawa to place on file with reference in the minutes the pay for performance spreadsheet as presented for further review. Motion carried.

Moved by Alderwoman Fliss, seconded by Alderman Wattawa to adjourn to Closed Session for discussion regarding: Wisconsin Statutes §19.85(1)(e) Deliberating or negotiating the purchasing of public properties, the investing of public funds, or conducting other specified public business, whenever competitive or bargaining reasons require a closed session – Fire Department Union Negotiations for 2016-2017 Labor Agreement; Police Department Union Negotiations for 2016-2017 Labor Agreement. Motion carried.

Time: 5:41 p.m.